THE

PROGRAMME OF PEACE.

BY A

DEMOCRAT OF THE OLD SCHOOL.

BOSTON:
TICKNOR & FIELDS,
1862.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

Acad.
Univ. y Cuzco

283194

BIBLIOTECA
CENTRAL
UNMSM

THE PROGRAMME OF PEACE.

No. 1. By referring the matter from argument to arms, a new era for politics is struck—a new method of thinking hath arisen. All plans, proposals, &c., prior to the 19th of April—*i. e.*, to the commencement of hostilities—are like the almanacs of the last year, which, though proper then, are superseded and useless now.—COMMON SENSE.

No. 2. Man has no property in man; neither has any generation a property in the generations which are to follow.—RIGHTS OF MAN.

My text No. 1, is from a modest little tract dating not many months beyond the Declaration of American Independence, and which is commonly admitted to have done more than any other writing to produce the public sentiment which gave birth to that remarkable document and the independence it declared. As conclusive evidence of the appropriateness of the title, common sense, it may be mentioned that ten years after its publication the American Congress voted to its author the sum of $3,000 as "a gratification from the United States." Pennsylvania gave him five hundred pounds; New York a farm. These gratifications were made prior to the publication of the work which contains our text No. 2, which is perhaps none the less true, though it may be less entitled to be considered the common sense of the country, for that. One can hardly fail to regret that it was not included in the earlier tract. Had it been so, perhaps it would have saved the war of 1861, and the painful labor of converting a truism into common sense in 1862.

It is only because text No. 2 has never become the common sense of the United States that the present trouble has come upon us, and that now we neither know what is best to be done in it, nor who should pay for doing it. In precisely the sense intended by Mr. Paine this generation seems to think itself the property of that which framed and adopted the Federal consti-

tution; that our grandfathers used up for all time the right to make constitution, except in a way which just now happens to be impracticable, therefore theirs, as they made it, or none. Such is now the common sense, or rather, as we hope to show, nonsense.

Do we condemn the great constitutional bridge which has carried the nation safe over three-quarters of a century, from a population of three millions to thirty, from beggary to the front rank of the civilized nations? On the contrary, the less we count ourselves its bond-servants, the more we venerate it. It is a most excellent bridge,—as far as it goes,—and if it ever comes to harm it will be from those who seem determined that no part of any flood shall reach the sea except by going under its arches. Talking of bridges reminds the writer of an incident of a horseback journey he took soon after the war of 1812 in a part of the country which was then called the West. The route lay across the muddy little river Mahoning. It presented itself, however, sooner than it was expected as a gently flowing current, about a mile in width, with a respectable wooden bridge looming above it like an island, apparently near its further margin. "The bridge is all right stranger; strike a bee-line to it from where you are, and then from it to where you'll see the road on t'other side, and you won't have no trouble" was the affectionate marginal direction of a good woman who was in the act of conveying her pigs from the lower level of their humble stye to the higher level of her cabin floor. The water came nowhere much above the stirrups, though it doubtless would have done so, if the bridge had not stood firm, and been made part of the road. On the return, a few weeks after, the whole river was running quietly beneath the bridge, and it was hard to believe it could ever do otherwise. Had there been enough Vallandinghams in that neighborhood to prevent the water from running any where but under the bridge, that useful structure would of course have gone with the flood. The water was allowed to be extra-constitutional.

In our present unforeseen circumstances, if we are to be indebted to our grandfathers for all the constitution we need, we must regard what they did as well as what they said. After their 19th of April they had the common sense to take their facts as they found them, and postpone their old theories. Since our 19th of April almost every-body has insisted that our peculiar facts must be governed by the theories of those who failed to foresee these facts. In the main our grandfathers were true prophets, that is, so far as their modesty did not make them less than such, for the results of their labors have exceeded their predictions. As to slavery, however, they provided in the fundamental law neither for nor against it, in any specific or unequivocal sense, so confident were they that local laws would soon bring it to an end. In this particular alone they have proved false prophets. Hence the deluge. Wherein they were false prophets could they be true legislators? We are worse than dead men if we do not supply their deficiency of law from their sufficiency of principle.

Account for it, excuse it, whitewash it as we will, slaveholding, *per se*, belongs to the natural category of crimes. It can never be any more than relatively innocent. The microscopic moralist, scanning individual specimens in the heart of Africa or South Carolina, may have occasion to applaud the man who saves as a chattel the enemy he might have slaughtered in battle, or purchases a useless slave to save a family from separation. Crime has its upper as well as its under side. The rottenest marshes are beautified with blossoms, some perhaps of the finest, and which grow nowhere else. Yet when slavery as an institution projects out, solitary and alone, from the ages of barbarism into an age of civilization, Christianity and science, it becomes an enormous promontory of crime, without the relief of relative innocence. The old evils, beneath whose shade it might have seemed virtuous, have left it all ugly, putrid, hideous. Its vitality then becomes the mortality of whatever good it touches. It must work to restore the old kindred evils or perish.

Truly enough do the benign optimists tell us it is better to let ten criminals escape than to punish one innocent person. That will do very well when crime is in a despised minority. But when the guilty begin to punish the innocent, it is better that a great many innocent persons should perish—if their changing worlds or positions in this world can be called perishing—rather than that crime and innocence should permanently change places, and law become inverted. Slaveholders, in behalf of their system of crime, have produced a war in which thousands of wholly innocent persons—positively and relatively innocent—must lose property or life. It will not then be necessarily a fatal objection to any particular solution of the problem of peace, that it involves the destruction of some relatively innocent slaveholders, or even of some other loyal persons. The question must be, How can the guilty be frustrated and peace secured with the least damage to the innocent, and the smallest departure from the formulas of the Constitution? Let us face the facts, and the fancies which surround the facts like a fog, and see how this is.

The two now hostile sections set out together under a government against which nothing honest could rebel, with all the differences, save slavery, in favor of the Southern section. The Slave States started with an equal population, one-third more territory, one-quarter more of average sunshine on a given area, apparently equal wealth of muck and minerals to the acre, hygienic conditions on the whole superior, and now their population, counting in the slaves, is but two-thirds, and their wealth, counting the slaves as property, but three-fourths of what is shown by the Free States. The Free States compare well with the most civilized and well-ordered countries on the globe. The Slave States are characterized by ignorance and Lynch law; education, comfort and the blessings of civilization, being almost wholly confined to the people who own slaves and the commercial and professional classes who depend upon their custom and patronage. According to De Bow's analysis of the census of 1850, of the 6,222,000 whites in Slave

States, only about 347,000 owned slaves, and to make this number each slaveholder was counted as many times as there were counties either of the same or different States in which he owned slaves. Supposing the white family of a slaveholder to consist of six persons, this would give a population directly interested in slave property of only 2,082,000. The census gave the free males over fifteen years of age in Slave States occupied in professional or other pursuits requiring education, and in commerce, trade, manufactures, mechanic arts and mining, as 408,308. Supposing none of these to have owned slaves, though such people at the south commonly enough own one or two, doubling the number for females, and adding forty per cent. for children, we have a population of 1,143,262 which might have had an indirect interest in slave property. This, added to the slaveholding population would leave nearly three millions of whites who could have had no tangible interest in slavery, direct or indirect. If they had any occupation at all it was that of agricultural laborers,* in a labor market where, unless they should happen to be proprietors of land, they must work in competition with human machines, for such wages as would suffice to keep those machines lubricated and in working repair—unless haply themselves employed to run the machines, which might be the lot of a few thousands. We shall see presently what chance there is that the ownership of land may have saved these three millions—now four millions —of slaveless whites from being crushed between the millstones of slavery.

As slave property is always tending to mass itself with the largest land owners, it is not probable that the number of slave-

* De Bow gives the free males employed in agriculture in the Slave States as 926,318. Supposing this number not to contain a single person belonging to the family of a slaveholder, it would represent a population of only about two and a half millions, leaving half a million of whites without any occupation whatever, though having no interest direct or indirect in the labor of slaves. If the slaveholders furnished one person in every family as occupied in agriculture, which is probable, then a population of at least 1,200,000 poor whites had no occupation.

owners has materially increased since 1850. Of the less than three hundred and fifty thousand counted by De Bow, by counting the largest owners several times, there were more than three hundred thousand who did not reach the ownership of twenty slaves—and this number could have contained few of the duplicated or multiplied beauties. The reduction for repetition must be made from the 37,662 who owned twenty slaves or more.

A man must own more than twenty slaves to derive any great wealth or consequence from slavery, in fact to belong to the slaveholding aristocracy. By owning less than twenty he is only qualified to be the dupe and tool of that aristocracy, to swear its oaths and fight its battles. More than half the four millions of Southern slaves are undoubtedly now owned by less than thirty thousand men, representing by their families less than two hundred thousand of the Southern white population. To all the rest of that population, amounting to more than seven millions and a half, slavery, as an "institution," does nothing but make them poorer and wickeder than they would otherwise be. The small minority, about one-fortieth of the Southern white population, which thus monopolizes chattel labor, also monopolizes land. And though their own pet "institution" robs their own real estate of a value greater than the market price of their slaves, by keeping their neighbors in ignorance and making labor distasteful to them, it gives them a relative political power far beyond what they could expect from a larger or any amount of wealth in a more intelligent community.

The damage which slavery has done to the market value of all the Southern land, that which belongs to non-slaveholders as well as slaveholders, is the difference between what it would bring at its own average price, and what it would bring at the average free State price, supposing Southern crops not more valuable to the acre. This by the figures of 1850, would be about $2,400,000,000. This only partly measures the cost to the common weal of supporting for three-quarters of a

century the sable order of nobility which is now bloodily engaged in overturning the government founded by Washington, Jefferson, the Adamses and Franklin.

It is worth the most careful attention now, to see how completely slavery has reversed the republican tendency to the equal distribution of landed estate, and created within the narrow slavocracy itself a still narrower landocracy. Though the non-slaveholders of the South, when they own any land at all, usually own smaller parcels than our small Northern freeholders, the average size of the Southern farms or plantations, of which single slaveholders often own many, is nearly three times that of the Northern, proving a vastly greater inequality of distribution. De Bow, in his compendium of the census of 1850, illustrates this subject by a table of specimen counties, which he regards as fair representatives of the different sections. From the South he takes seven counties in South Carolina, one in Kentucky, and five in Louisiana; from the North, four in Michigan, one in Ohio, two in Pennsylvania, and three in Rhode Island. If the reader will pardon so many figures, we will condense De Bow's table to a comparison of the Northern and Southern farms contained in it, in point of size, giving in the first two columns De Bow's classification of all the farms in the counties he selects, and in the second two, the proportional number in each class to a total of 10,000.

It is proper, however, here to observe, that while De Bow's samples are fair illustrations of the two opposite systems of agriculture in the North and South, his Southern sample contains rather less than the average proportion of unimproved land for the South, and considerably more than the average proportion of slaves to whites—in fact a slave and a half to every white. The counties are all rural except one in South Carolina, which contains Charleston, King Cotton's own capital, yet the Southern ones could give every individual inhabitant, including their 180,000 slaves, about twenty acres of land apiece.

	Northern.	Southern.	Northern.	Southern.
Less than 5 acres,	52	194	69	163
5 and less than 10,	48	152	64	128
10 and less than 50,	1,148	1,836	1,525	1,543
50 and less than 100,	2,549	1,163	3,385	977
100 and less than 500,	3,651	5,338	4,848	4,485
500 and less than 1,000,	63	1,761	84	1,480
1,000 and less than 10,000,	19	1,440	25	1,210
10,000 and upwards,	–	17	–	14
Totals,	7,530	11,901	10,000	10,000

A disparity of landed estate does not of itself argue any political defect or any oppression of one class by another. It is inevitable to a certain extent, where all are equal before the law, and law follows as closely as possible the path of nature and reason. But De Bow's classification of Southern farms reveals not only a much greater disparity, but the series is broken by a remarkable depression between the farms which are less than fifty and those which are larger than one hundred acres. This depression, to borrow a military phrase, is a point of great strategic importance. It is, in fact, a valley separating the mountain of the slaveholding nobility, whose interest in slavery has created this rebellion, from the little hill of slaveless or nearly slaveless landholders, whose interest, if they only knew it, is against slavery, and who have been duped into rebellion. Let us illustrate this.

By recurring to the census we find the population and acres of the counties comprised in the above table as follows:—

	Population.	Acres of Land.
Northern,	104,595	916,086
Southern,	297,604	5,946,909

If we give to the 3,345 Southern farms which do not exceed 100 acres their maximum size in each class, they make only 127,970 acres, leaving 5,818,939 acres to be divided among the other 8,556 farms, giving 680 acres, or forty acres more than a square mile, to each. That is, on one side of the valley in this example are probably more than three thousand poor men who own farms that cannot exceed an average of thirty-eight acres, and probably do not exceed one of twenty, robbed of two-thirds their value by slavery. On the other side are nearly nine thousand farms averaging more than a square mile each, which are probably in the possession of not more than half the same number of proprietors. This is characteristic of all of the South which has gone thoroughly and heartily into the rebellion. The gradation from the large to the little landholders, which is perfect in all the Free States, is here broken by a wide interval. The great landholders, who make slavery pay after a fashion—partly in cash, partly in the servile homage of a dependent population—are as distinctly separated from the lower million as any order of nobility ever was. From their elevation the poor whites and chattel blacks are apparently on a dead level. The educated professionals are parasitic.

It is thus that slavocracy and landocracy go hand in hand, with equal gait. They mutually sustain each other. To a landed aristocracy slavery supplies the place of the right of primogeniture, only it is more effectual. It makes the largest estates constantly devour the smallest.

A landed aristocracy being once established and distinguished from the rest of the people by a wide interval, must, even without the support of the right of primogeniture or chattel slavery, if surrounded by an ignorant and degraded peasantry, have a long lease of life, and be to republicanism a dangerous antagonistic force. Such a body of men having a common interest, adverse to that of the common people, must necessarily control the local government. Having control of its section, what it would do to the Union, every one knows from what it has done. Arrogating all the civilization, it would overwhelm it with savages.

Not more certain is the fact that there exists in the slave States a distinct class of large slaveholders, who are also as distinctly a class of large landholders, than that this class is thoroughly and intelligently rebellious. Individual exceptions are of course possible. A few are known to exist. Suppose there are ten times as many more, which are not known. The proportion is still not greater than that which failed to save a certain sea port of the Dead Sea. So unanimous was this remarkably self-conscious class of Southerners, while the great conspiracy was brewing for years, that no rebuke or exposure came from any part of it—not a lisp which was not set down as an idiosyncrasy or a joke. Substantially thirty thousand hypocrites paraded daily in the sacerdotal cloaks of Unionism, burning incense to the Constitution, and only asking for their darling "institution" what the Constitution guaranteed, while they were secretly preparing deadly weapons to strike down the Constitution itself and the rights of all other men under it. Never was a national secret so kept; never a conspiracy so thorough. The theory that it grew out of the individual ambition of a few uneasy or disappointed politicians is at war with facts, figures and human nature, and must lead to the most deplorable consequences, if made the basis of the terms of peace. Only the ignorant could be misled by designing politicians. The very fact that so many millions of white people who know nothing of the Free States, except what the privileged class pleases to permit them, have been so deluded, proves a wonderful unanimity in the intelligent people of the South, that is, the large slaveholders and their parasites. None of the thirty thousand grandees of King Cotton who employ overseers and summer at fashionable watering places could be made innocent dupes.

Though the ignorant white people of the Slave States are full of prejudice and hatred towards the people of the Free States, though the manifestations of practical barbarity come more commonly from them than from the educated and "refined" class, it does not follow that they are the real enemies of the

government or of the Union. They are simply fighting against fancies which have been imposed upon them by a faction which has ever since they were born controlled the press of the South, and excluded almost every publication of the Northern press which called in question the rectitude of its own doings or the divinity of its peculiar "institution." With the most savage ferocity has this faction trampled out every spark of argument designed to show the non-slaveholding whites that their interests are adverse to those of the slaveholders. When a North Carolinian proposed to publish such an argument, he was obliged to print in a Free State, and the sale of his book in his own State was punished as a crime. The enmity and hatred of ignorance can be annihilated by the sunshine of truth, and as it is too extensive to be conquered by any storm of force, there is no road to peace with the Southern masses except by a liberal policy addressed to their true interests. But the enmity of those who hate us because they know us, and know that our system of labor is conformable to the spirit of the Constitution and of the age, while theirs is not, cannot be conquered by sunshine. That has been tried to the utmost, and failed.

Such are the general facts that make a restoration of the state before the war equivalent to defeat. They are surrounded by such fancies as these: That there is an incompatibility of races which caused certain people to be left out of the Constitution, and which forbids them ever to be let in: That industry and order would be annihilated by sundering the chains of slavery too suddenly.

To dispute about tastes is never wise, least of all in times like these, when more practical questions have the floor. Visions of a homogeneous nation produced by transplanting nearly the whole industrial population from more than half of our country, where its labor is in demand, to some region where it is not, must certainly be laid by for the present among other Spanish castles. Their possibility is too remote to allow them to be made conditions precedent of any thing this side of the final judgment. In the mean time, the dilettanti in matters of taste

and cultivators of fancy races should comfort themselves with this palpable fact, that so far as the so-called incompatible race has any where been admitted to such political rights as are recognized in the Declaration of Independence, as belonging to all men, and nowhere expressly denied to any race in the Constitution of the United States, it has shown a strong tendency to keep distinct, and none whatever either to adulterate, overgrow or incommode the other races. Whereas, whenever and wherever that race has been introduced among others without such rights, nature has deeply revenged herself against the doctrine of incompatibility, and shocked the taste of our choicest ethnologists, without mercy.

To an impartial and dispassionate observer the beauty of the free American System of politics is, that the greater the number and diversity of races embraced under it, the less is the danger of its going to pieces by the ordinary antagonisms of ins and outs, rich and poor, or of different localities. For the ties of race are sure to run, like the woof to the warp, crosswise of the other divisions.

Nations are amused by their tastes, but governed by their necessities. The destruction of slavery and the very foundation on which it stands has become a necessity, whatever damage may come from it. Whatever that damage may be, it certainly will not be to any considerable extent disorder or the cessation of industry on the part of the freed men, however suddenly they may have become so. Labor with them is an established habit, and when the wonted stimulus is removed, must still, as a general thing proceed, unless positively obstructed by external causes, by the mere momentum of habit, coupled as they say at the West, with the "root hog or die" principle. Far more evil and difficulty is to be apprehended from the habits of idleness and improvidence which slavery has nursed in the white classes South. As these habits cannot be immediately reversed, the sudden advent of a free system of labor must meet with serious obstacles in them, and temporary suffering must result. One of the obvious compensations of the war, however, is, that

it has been educating multitudes of the poor thriftless whites to habits of physical exertion and endurance, if not of self-respect, which will make it easier for them to assume a respectable place in the reconstructed industry of the South. It may also have dispelled some superstitions and implanted some valuable ideas.

If the foregoing view of the case commends itself to reason, the true programme of peace becomes plain. It is to treat as friends the whole Southern population whose interests are not at war with the system of labor supported by the majority of the people of the United States, and the rest as enemies, who must be made to pay for the war as far as their means go, and above all things be deprived of the means of repeating their offence. Enemies who have forfeited their lives cannot complain if they are only deprived of their property. The peculiar property of slaveholders cannot pay for the war, but it can be made to help wage it. Their land can be made good security for the pay. It must be seized at once and mainly taken from them, or even the loss of all their slaves would leave them dangerous enemies, in spite of any oaths of allegiance. While the great landed estates remain to them or to their heirs or assigns, barbarism and ignorance remain. The poverty of the laboring masses remains. The stumps of slavery itself remain in the soil, ready to sprout more luxuriantly than ever under the sunshine of a peace paid for by northern taxes, and watered by the showers of northern dissension and weakness which must grow out of such taxes. In short, the old humbug of a little, proud, compact, malignant, hypocritical minority passing itself off for so many sovereign States, and its will for the laws of those States, remains.

Confiscation, in a legal and technical sense, is attended with difficulties. It was not resorted to at all in case of the original possessors of our soil, whose titles were suspended if not extinguished, by a more summary process. It was applied pretty largely to the tories of the Revolution, but the process was tedious and the results not altogether satisfactory. If the

rebels, like the tories, should colonize themselves and their heirs with them, the subject might be relieved of some of its difficulties, but would still be a sore one to professional conveyancers, who could hardly be reconciled to the salvation of the country if it had to be purchased at the expense of serious informalities in the titles of real estate. But taxation does not have to depend criminal process, and is a much simpler business. Let every person who owns three hundred acres or more of land, which is, or was at the commencement of the war, cultivated by the labor of slaves, without regard to the State where it is located, be taxed fifteen dollars per acre for all that it exceeds fifty acres, by the government of the United States, to pay the expenses of the war. If the tax is not paid in gold within a time fixed, let all above the said fifty acres be seized by the government, and either sold to satisfy the tax, so far as the price will go, or be held to secure the national debt by future sale, or to provide land bounties for our soldiers, or allotments to landless people in the neighborhood whose industry and good conduct it may be important to secure by that means.

France and England need not fear that this breaking up of the large plantations will diminish their chances of a supply of cotton and tobacco. On the contrary, that supply will be rendered more sure by the government promptly selling, leasing, or giving away the greater part of the lands fit for such crops, to parties qualified to employ and direct free laborers, than it could possibly be by any peace which should leave the land in possession of the present proprietors, who would attempt to carry on the old system of labor, or any new one imposed upon them in the temper of the old. For, if the war shall not have converted the slaves into freemen, it will have ruined them as slaves. To guard more securely against the failure of the great Southern staples, the government might provide temporarily for the cultivation of the largest estates undivided, advancing funds if needful for implements and wages, and taking a mortgage on the crop for this advance and the rent.

There is land enough in the slave States to endow its entire agricultural population, together with its landless population now unemployed, with the average northern farm of 128 acres to a family, and leave about 70,000,000 acres. By laying the tax above proposed, the government, after reorganizing by means of the already improved land, Southern industry, and providing for the order, loyalty, and good conduct of the poor whites, the *debris* of the rebel armies, and the freed slaves, and also endowing any of our own brave soldiers who might choose to remain at the South, would still find itself in possession of an amount of unimproved land which, as soon as it should feel the full influence of the free system, would be worth a thousand millions of money.

If the Federal Government, under its war power, has a right to charge batteries with projectiles that sweep down the active and passive rebels alike, destroying a score of deluded, involuntary enemies, to reach one who is an intelligent and voluntary foe, can it not charge a battery with an agrarian law which will only annihilate without killing the real rebels and convert the artificial ones into friends? Hundred pounder Parrott guns alone cannot conquer a peace in the Slave States. They may destroy a certain percentage of men and scatter all the large armies, but they cannot prevent these armies from filling the wildest and biggest part of the country with brigands, who will prey equally on master and slave, and cost more to exterminate than ten times as many Indian savages. Let the rank and file be tempted to cultivate land of their own before such habits are established.

The South is a vast, wild country. Even our statesmen and generals seem not yet to have grapsed the idea of its vastness and wildness. The four millions of slaves know it better, and this knowledge has saved them from wasting much blood in insurrection, which they know must fail for want of comprehensiveness. If it takes nearly the whole military power of the North to surround the South and cope with armies that would transfer the war to northern and western soil or keep their sea-

ports open, what will it take to pervade the whole 800,000 square miles in order to subdue the same armies converted into banditti? It is plain enough that this cannot be easily done, if at all, without enlisting new forces. It would be better to prevent such a dissolution of the southern armies, but perhaps it is too late for that.

Considering the peculiar structure of southern society, the vastness and wildness over which it spreads, and the unparalleled animosity and depravity which slavery has engendered, it is surely not easy to see how the Southern States can be brought to any thing like peaceful allegiance to the Union—and to sit down beside them as a foreign slave-oligarchy is not to be thought of, and never was thought of by any sane person, —without coöperation with some part of their population. We might coöperate with the poorer part of the whites if they could be made to see their own interests. But do what we will that is a work of some time; we can never be sure of any of them till *they* can be made sure that they have nothing to hope or to fear in future from the slaveholding oligarchy which they have been born to worship. The aid of southern whites is therefore not immediately available. The case is different with the black population.

The first compromise on the slavery question—fountain of evils—was that made by the Revolutionary Congress before the Declaration of Independence in conceding to Edward Rutledge of South Carolina, who moved that negro troops should be discharged from the continental army. Negroes had fought, and fought bravely at Bunker Hill, and took the action of Congress as brave men naturally would such heartless ingratitude. Thereupon wrote Washington to the President of Congress, "It has been represented to me, that the free negroes, who have served in this army, are very much dissatisfied at being disbanded. As it is to be apprehended, that they may seek employ in the ministerial army, I have presumed to depart from the resolution respecting them, and have given license for their being enlisted. If this is disapproved of by Congress, I will put

a stop to it." Washington's biographer, (see Sparks, Vol. iii., page 218,) makes this note on the passage: "At a meeting of the general officers previously to the arrival of the committee from Congress in camp, it was unanimously resolved, that it was not expedient to enlist slaves in the new army, and by a large majority negroes of every description were excluded from enlistment. When the subject was referred to the committee in conference, this decision was confirmed. In regard to free negroes, however, the resolve was not adhered to, and probably for the reason here mentioned by General Washington. Many black soldiers were in the service during all stages of the war." For example, a whole battalion was raised in Rhode Island. Another was brought by our French allies from St. Domingo, and fought in the bloodiest battle of the Revolution, at Savannah. It afterwards achieved distinction fighting against the British in its own country. Though Congress thus yielded to Rutledge, there seems to have been no doubt on the part of the best judges that the blacks made good soldiers. Henry Laurens wrote to Washington, March 16, 1779: "Had we arms for three thousand such black men, as I could select in Carolina, I should have no doubt of success in driving the British out of Georgia, and subduing East Florida, before the end of July." Washington replied: "The policy of our arming slaves is in my opinion a moot point, unless the enemy set the example. For should we begin to form battalions of them, I have not the smallest doubt, if the war is to be prosecuted, of their following us in it, and justifying the measure upon our own ground. The contest then must be, who can arm fastest. And where are our arms? Besides, I am not clear that a discrimination will not render slavery more irksome to those who remain in it. Most of the good and evil things of this life are judged of by comparison; and I fear a comparison in this case will be productive of much discontent in those who are held in servitude. But as this is a subject that has never employed much of my thoughts, these are no more than the first crude ideas that have struck me on the occasion."

Afterwards, in 1782, when Col. John Laurens complained to Washington that the Legislature of South Carolina had refused to give him leave to raise "a regiment of black levies," the latter spoke of the failure as due to the fact that the spirit of freedom had subsided and every selfish passion had taken its place, and predicted that the zealous colonel would have no better success in Georgia. Can there be any doubt what the father of his country would do in the present state of facts? Not one of the facts which sustained his "crude ideas" against arming the enslaved blacks in 1779 now exists, save on the side of the secessionists, who have "set the example," and thus removed the only one which could exist on our side. We can arm faster than they, and the more discontented their or our doing so makes the remaining slaves, the better for us.

The right of a government to arm any and every class of its subjects is perhaps older than the human race—certainly it dates back to the time when the king of beasts first went to war, who justified his enlistment from all the different races of animals in a speech so remarkable for its good sense that it was deemed worthy of record by that oracle of sense, the immortal Æsop.

The right of the subject to bear arms and form a part of the national forces is the very keystone of the rights that go to form a free government. There are peculiar reasons why the blacks should be allowed to enjoy their most sacred of rights in this war. Their manhood is the very question. With provocation enough to justify any personal vengeance that could prove effective, they have waited for the supreme government of the Union to vindicate their cause. Though lying is said to be the vice of slaves, in this war we have only heard it from the masters. Little encouragement as slaves have had held out to them, and often as they have been heartlessly delivered up, the information brought by them has in almost no instance proved false or deceptive, and it has seldom failed to come in time of need. On the side of the Federal Government they can be trusted with arms, one and all, the moment they understand that the people and government of the United States

count them in under the Constitution. A brigade or two of them will entirely cure the whites of the South of their idea of guerrilla warfare. Black soldiers can play at that. If they are sent into the bush with guns in their hands to fight for the government that has made them free, it will be very different from the old game where all the guns, and the dogs to boot, were in the hands of the white parties. Slave hunts have been a passion with the chivalry, but few, either at their own expense or for confederate notes, could afford to hunt armed black soldiers in the service of the United States. Waging a "servile war" against slaves backed by the United States would be harder work than even to face United States armies in the open field.

A free republic which means to continue free should not engage in a war which cannot be made to pay its expenses. One so powerful as ours never need do it. Much less should it put down a rebellion without making the rebels pay its expense to the extent of their means. To do this in the present case is the only possible success. Rebeldom cannot be made fit to live with or live by, without distinguishing the active from the passive rebels, the slaveholding nobility from its duped and enslaved peasantry, and stripping the former of all the wealth which elevates it above the latter, in order to introduce the true American civilization. With this programme of peace fairly resolved on and announced, the government will have no need of copying the odious European system of taxation, any further than perhaps the taxes on spirits and tobacco, to insure the extinction of slavery in 1862, and of the national debt incurred in extinguishing it, as early as 1892.

Does this programme contemplate any destruction of Southern wealth, or Southern intelligence? Not a dollar; not an idea. It would destroy nothing but the pride of a small tyrannical class. The men with all they know how to do, which is worth doing, are left there to do it, or die. The land is opened to the capital and skill of the civilized world, with all its natives

placed in a position to enjoy the benefit of such capital and skill. The curse is wholly, instead of partially, lifted off.

The dog has been permitted to lie growling in the manger for a fair dog's age. He might, if he had chosen, have lain there an age longer. Now that he has gone mad and fleshed his teeth in the hostler, is he, or any possible pup of his, to continue to enjoy the manger as a vested right?

Wright & Potter, Prs., 4 Spring Lane, Boston.